REMARKS

Claims 31-39 and 55-59 are pending. Claims 31-39 and 55-59 are rejected. Claims 35, 36, 55, and 58 are objected to. Claims 31, 35, 36, 55, and 58 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Telephone Interview Summary

With respect to the examiner interviews conducted on February 17 and 21, 2006, Applicants have nothing further to add to the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully agree with the Examiner's summation of the interviews, and believe the Examiner's Interview Summary form to be a complete and proper recordation of the interviews.

Claim Objections

Claims 35, 36, 55, and 58 are objected to for various informalities. These informalities have been corrected. Applicants respectfully submit that these objections are moot, and requests that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 31 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the phrase "is not performed directly" is objected to by the examiner, as not appearing in the specification.

Applicants have amended Claims 31 and 55. Claim 31 now recites that an

embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

> A time sensitive quality of service management system comprising:
> a communication port for communicating information;
> a switching circuit for providing an output communication path
> to said communication port and performing unscheduled cut through
> routing of a communication path probe, wherein said probe is discarded
> if said unscheduled cut through routing cannot be performed within a
> time constraint associated with said probe, said switching circuit
> coupled to said communication port;
> a processor for directing said switching circuit to perform
> unscheduled cut through routing of a said communication path probe
> and a communication path probe update, including discarding said
> communication path probe and associated information if said
> unscheduled cut through routing of said probe cannot be performed
> within said time constraint, said processor coupled to said switching
> circuit; and
> a memory for storing information associated with the control of
> said switching circuit by said processor, said memory coupled to said
> processor.

Claim 55 recites similar limitations. Support for these amendments may be found in the

specification, e.g., at pg. 20, ln. 4 - pg. 21, ln. 5, the specification describes the operation

of time sensitive quality of service management system 100, in which a cut through probe

is dropped if the system is busy; see also pg. 13, ln. 14 - pg. 14, ln. 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present rejections are therefore moot, and

request that they be withdrawn. Applicants further respectfully submit that Claims 31-39

and 55-59 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: _____6/7/06_____, 2006

Kevin A. Brown
Reg. No. 56,303
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060